UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/897,217	07/14/1997	DAWSON F. DEAN	P-2057/723	4193

22801 7590 01/31/2003

LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER
BULLOCK JR, LEWIS ALEXANDER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	

DATE MAILED: 01/31/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	08/897,217	DEAN, DAWSON F.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lewis A. Bullock, Jr.	2126	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 October 2002* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-15 and 22-32* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-15 and 22-32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-15 and 22-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over SAVITZKY (US 6,012,083) in view of "Java Developer's Guide" by JAWORSKI. As to claim 1, SAVITZKY teaches a method for serving remote procedure calls from a client (client / browser), the method comprising: receiving from the client a request for a document (document request / request in URL) (client sends a server a document request for a document in the form of a URL) (col. 1, line 63 – col. 2, line 5); determining that the request specifies a function (execute script) which is defined within a computer process (server program) executing independently of the client (server identifies the request as a request to execute a script rather than a request for a document) (col. 2, lines 7-10); and executing the function in response to receipt of the request (the server executes the CGI script, possibly using arguments passes as part of the URL) (col. 1, line 63 – col. 2, line 43). It is inherent that the script has instructions that are thereby executed when invoked in order to generate the document. It is also inherent that since the request is a request to execute a script and not a request for a document, that the request is unrelated to any generation or retrieval of a document. However, SAVITZKY does not teach the server as a local server wherein the system

that generates the request is the system that serves it or that the client is an applet which executes on an applet viewer.

JAWORSKI teaches a browser which sends a request according to a document retrieval protocol implemented on a computer network (HTTP POST / GET requests) to a web server (WebServerApp / localhost) (pg. 521, A Web Server) that is on the same machine as the browser (web browser) (pg. 524, paragraphs after NOTE, "Launch your favorite Web browser and open the URL of your machine followed by :8080.."; pg. 525, "If you cannot find your hostname, you can use localhost instead.") and that a network client (browser) is a delivery mechanism for an embedded client (applet) (pg. 563, Using Applets as Network Clients). It would be obvious that since the browser and the web server are stored on the same system, i.e. they have the same machine URL, they are local to one another and that when combined with the teachings of SAVITZKY, the functions are therefore sent and executed on the same system. It would also be obvious that since the browser operates as a delivery mechanism for an applet that when combined with the teachings of SAVITZKY the applet would initially generate the request. Therefore, it would be obvious to combine the teachings of SAVITZKY with the teachings of JAWORSKI in order to facilitate local processing of requests.

As to claim 2, SAVITZKY teaches the client (client / browser) sending a document request (document request) in the form of a URL where the URL refers not to a document on the server but to a program on the server (via a script) (col. 1, line 63 – col. 2, line 20). A URL is a portion of namespace in a browser for identifying resources

or documents and since the URL in SAVITZKY is used to identify a function as well as a document, the URL is a namespace in the browser for function requests.

As to claim 3, SAVITZKY teaches returning to the client result data produced by execution of the function (dynamic document of server side code execution) (col. 2, lines 10-14; col. 2, lines 5-7).

As to claim 4, SAVITZKY teaches the returning comprises: forming a document which includes data; and sending the document (dynamic document of server side code execution) to the client (client / browser) (col. 2, lines 10-14; col. 2, lines 5-7). JAWORSKI teach the request is generated by an applet (applet / embedded HTTP client) executing on an applet viewer (browser client / delivery mechanism) (pg. 563, Using Applets as Network Clients). It would be obvious that since the applet generated the request that it receives the results as disclosed by SAVITZKY.

As to claim 5, JAWORSKI teaches the document retrieval protocol is HTTP (pg. 521, A Web Server).

As to claims 6-10, reference is made to a computer readable medium that corresponds to the method of claims 1-5 and is therefore met by the rejection of claims 1-5 above.

As to claims 11-15, reference is made to a system that corresponds to the method of claim 1-5 and is therefore met by the rejection of claims 1-5 above.

As to claim 22, JAWORSKI teaches the function includes a remote procedure call (create WebServer object and invokes its run method) (pg. 525).

As to claim 23, SAVITZKY teaches a method for serving remote procedure calls from within a first computer process (browser / client), the method comprising: receiving a request for a data file (document request / request in URL) (client sends a server a document request for a document in the form of a URL) (col. 1, line 63 – col. 2, line 5); determining that the request specifies a function (execute script) which is defined within a second computer process (server program) executing independently of the first computer process (server identifies the request as a request to execute a script rather than a request for a document) (col. 2, lines 7-10); and executing the function in response to receipt of the request (the server executes the CGI script, possibly using arguments passes as part of the URL) (col. 1, line 63 – col. 2, line 43). It is inherent that the script has instructions that are thereby executed when invoked in order to generate the document and that the browser / client and server has instructions which enable it to request / send and process a request. It is also inherent that since the request is a request to execute a script and not a request for a document, that the request is unrelated to any generation or retrieval of a document. However, SAVITZKY does not

teach the server as a local server wherein the system that generates the request is the system that serves it.

JAWORSKI teaches a browser which sends a request according to a document retrieval protocol implemented on a computer network (HTTP POST / GET requests) to a web server (WebServerApp / localhost) (pg. 521, A Web Server) that is on the same machine as the browser (web browser) (pg. 524, paragraphs after NOTE, "Launch your favorite Web browser and open the URL of your machine followed by :8080.."; pg. 525, "If you cannot find your hostname, you can use localhost instead."). It would be obvious that since the browser and the web server are stored on the same system, i.e. they have the same machine URL, they are local to one another and that when combined with the teachings of SAVITZKY, the functions are therefore sent and executed on the same system. Therefore, it would be obvious to combine the teachings of SAVITZKY with the teachings of JAWORSKI in order to facilitate local processing of requests.

As to claim 24, SAVITZKY teaches the client sending a document request in the form of a URL where the URL refers not to a document on the server but to a program on the server (via a script). A URL is a portion of namespace in a browser for identifying resources or documents and since the URL in SAVITZKY is used to identify a function as well as a document, the URL is a namespace in the browser for function requests.

As to claim 25, SAVITZKY teaches returning to the result data produced by execution of the function (dynamic document of server side code execution) (col. 2, lines 10-14).

As to claim 26, SAVITZKY teaches the returning comprises: forming a document which includes data; and sending the document (dynamic document of server side code execution) to the first computer process (client / browser) (col. 2, lines 10-14; col. 2, lines 5-7).

As to claim 27, JAWORSKI teaches the document retrieval protocol is HTTP (pg. 521, A Web Server).

As to claims 28-32, reference is made to a system that corresponds to the method of claims 23-27 and is therefore met by the rejection of claims 23-27 above.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15 and 22-32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lewis A. Bullock, Jr. whose telephone number is (703)

305-0439. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alvin E. Oberley can be reached on (703) 305-9716. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-0286.

Lewis A. Bullock Jr

lab
January 24, 2003